Name AO 120 (Rev. 2/99)

TO: Mail Stop 8

Director of the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPORT ON THE FILING OR DETERMINATION OF AN ACTION REGARDING A PATENT OR TRADEMARK

In Compliance with 35 § 290 and/or 15 U.S.C. § 1116 you are hereby advised that a court action has been

		District of California on the following X Patents or Trademarks:	
DOCKET NO.	DATE FILED	U.S. DISTRICT COURT	
CV 11-04224 DMR	8/26/2011	Northern District of California, 1301 Clay St., #400-S, Oakland, CA 94612	
PLAINTIFF		DEFENDANT	
RIMAGE CORPORATION		INNOVATIVE AUTOMATION LLC.	
PATENT OR	DATE OF PATEN	I LIGHT OF DATENT OF TO A DEVANDE	
TRADEMARK NO.	OR TRADEMAR	K 1103321101 11112111 OK HAIDEMANIA	
17,174,362		****See attached complaint***	
2			
3		·	
4			
5			
In the above	ve—entitled case, the follo	wing patent(s) have been included:	
	I .	Amendment	
PATENT OR	DATE OF PATEN		
TRADEMARK NO.	OR TRADEMAR	HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK	
1			
2			
3		·	
4			
5			
In the abov	e—entitled case, the follow	ving decision has been rendered or judgement issued:	
DECISION/JUDGEMENT			
DECISION/JODGEMENT			
CLERK		(BY) DEPUTY CLERK DATE	

. 1	a			
2	1 7 (
3	E-mail: thottinger@wnlaw.com Charles J. Veverka (Pro Hac Application to be	filed, Utah State Bar No. 07110)		
4	E-mail: cveverka@wnlaw.com WORKMAN NyDEGGER A Professional Company			
5	20 Pacifica, Suite 1130 & 60 E. South Irvine, California 92618 Salt Lake	th Temple, Suite 1000 City, Utah 84111		
6	20 Pacifica, Suite 1130 & 60 E. Sout Irvine, California 92618 Salt Lake Telephone: (949) 242-1900 Telephone Facsimile: (949) 453-1104 Facsimile	e: (801) 533-98 : (801) 328-1707		
7	Eric L. Maschoff (Pro Hac Application to be fil	ed, Utah State Ade No. 06608)		
8	Eric L. Maschoff (Pro Hac Application to be filed, Utah State His No. 06608) E-mail: emaschoff@mgiip.com Rachel Jacques (Pro Hac Application to be filed, Utah State His No. 06608) E-mail: rjacques@mgiip.com Raschoff GILMORE & ISRAELSEN 1441 West Ute Boulevard, Suite 100 Park City, Utah 84008			
9	E-mail: rjacques@mgiip.com MASCHOFF GILMORE & ISRAELSEN	DISTRICT COURT		
10	1 ark City, Otali 64096	TORNIA		
11	Telephone: (435) 252-1360 Facsimile: (435) 252-1361	· - M		
12	Attorneys for Plaintiff RIMAGE CORPORATION ADA			
13		V		
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
15	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
16	SAN JOSE	E DIVISION O A S S A		
17	C	V11-04224 DMR		
18	RIMAGE CORPORATION,	Case No.		
19	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY		
20	v.	JUDGMENT		
21				
- 11	INNOVATIVE AUTOMATION LLC,	Demand for Jury Trial		
22	INNOVATIVE AUTOMATION LLC, Defendant.	Demand for Jury Trial		
22 23		Demand for Jury Trial		
		Demand for Jury Trial		
23		Demand for Jury Trial		
23 24		Demand for Jury Trial		
23 24 25		Demand for Jury Trial		
23 24 25 26		Demand for Jury Trial		
23 24 25 26 27		Demand for Jury Trial COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT		

Plaintiff Rimage Corporation ("Rimage") states its complaint against defendant Innovative Automation LLC ("Defendant"), and alleges as follows:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This is an action for declaratory judgment brought by Rimage pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201–02, and the Patent Laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 1 et seq., seeking a declaration that Rimage does not infringe U.S. Patent No. 7,174,362 ("the '362 Patent") [attached hereto as Exhibit A], and that the claims of the '362 Patent are invalid.

PARTIES

- 2. Rimage is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Minnesota, with its principal place of business at 7725 Washington Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55439.
- 3. On information and belief, Defendant is a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of the State of California, which claims to have its principal place of business at 606 North First Street, San Jose, California 95112.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 4. Defendant purports to be the owner of all rights, title, and interests in and to the '362 Patent. Defendant has raised a reasonable apprehension of the filing of a lawsuit against Rimage resulting in the establishment of a case or controversy between the parties in relation to the '362 Patent, as set forth below.
- 5. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338, 1367, 2201, and 2202, and the Patent Laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 1 et seq.
- 6. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant by virtue of its:

 (i) incorporation under the laws of the State of California, (ii) maintaining its principal place of business in this judicial District, and (iii) otherwise purposefully availing itself of the privileges and benefits of the laws of the State of California. Defendant has also sent, through its attorneys, written communications to at least one of Rimage's customers or potential customers in California alleging infringement of the '362 Patent at least in part because of the customer's use of Rimage products.

6

17

18

19

2021

2223

2425

2627

28

7. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400.

BACKGROUND

- 8. Rimage is based in Minneapolis, Minnesota and has additional offices in Germany and Japan. Rimage is in the field of digital publishing, duplication, and printing solutions.
- 9. Defendant purports to be the owner of all rights, title, and interests in and to the '362 Patent. On May 17 and June 12, 2011, Defendant's legal counsel sent separate letters to Isomedia, LLC ("Isomedia") [attached hereto collectively as Exhibit B], a client of Rimage, which letters read together allege that the "methods used by Isomedia to duplicate digital data may be covered by one or more claims" of the '362 patent.
- 10. The letters request that Isomedia take a license under the '362 Patent and assert that Isomedia is infringing the '362 Patent based, at least in part, on Isomedia's use of a Rimage duplication machine.
- 11. Rimage has not infringed and does not infringe, either directly or indirectly, any valid and enforceable claim of the '362 Patent.
- 12. A substantial controversy exists between Rimage and Defendant of sufficient immediacy and reality to trigger the jurisdictional requirements of the Declaratory Judgment Act.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Declaratory Judgment of No Infringement

of Any Valid Claim of the '362 Patent

- 13. Rimage restates, realleges, and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 12 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.
- 14. Rimage has not infringed, does not infringe, has not induced others to infringe, and does not contribute to the infringement, directly or indirectly, of any valid claim of the '362 Patent.
- 15. The acts described in the foregoing paragraphs create a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant a finding of declaratory judgment of no infringement of any valid claim of the '362 Patent.

1 SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF 2 Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity 3 of the Claims of the '362 Patent Rimage restates, realleges, and incorporates by reference the allegations contained 4 16. 5 in paragraphs 1 through 15 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein. 6 17. The claims of the '362 Patent are invalid for failure to comply with the conditions of patentability set forth in 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and/or 112. 18. The acts described in the foregoing paragraphs create a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant a finding of declaratory judgment of invalidity of each claim of the '362 Patent. PRAYER FOR RELIEF WHEREFORE, Rimage respectfully requests that judgment be entered in its favor and prays that the Court grant the following relief: 1. A declaration that Rimage has not infringed, either directly or indirectly, any valid and enforceable claim of the '362 Patent; 2. A declaration that the claims of the '362 Patent are invalid; 3. An Order from this Court preliminary and permanently enjoining Defendant, its agents and servants, and any and all parties acting in concert with any of them, from alleging, either directly or indirectly, that Rimage infringes any valid claim of the '362 Patent; 4. An order declaring that Rimage is a prevailing party and that this is an exceptional case, awarding Rimage its costs, expenses, disbursements, and reasonable attorney fees under 35 U.S.C. § 285 and all other applicable statutes, rules, and common law; and

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

111

111

111

111

111

5.

For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

JURY DEMAND Rimage hereby demands a trial by jury on all issues triable of right to a jury under Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. DATED: August 26, 2011 Sterling A. Brennan Tyson K. Hottinger Charles J. Veverka WORKMAN | NYDEGGER A Professional Corporation Eric L. Maschoff Rachel Jacques MASCHOFF GILMORE & ISRAELSEN Attorneys for Plaintiff RIMAGE CORPORATION 3461025-1

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT